DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 688 HE 002 088

AUTHOR	Mackay, Maxine
TITLE	Status of Women Committee: Faculty Report.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Univ. Professors, Tampa, Fla.
PUB DATE	18 Nov 70
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Employment Opportunities, *Employment Patterns, Faculty, Faculty Promotion, Females, *Higher Education, Salaries, Social Discrimination, *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida State University System

ABSTRACT

This report on the status of women summarized data from 6 sources. The report begins with a brief review of the reasons for an AAUP report on the status of women at the State University System of Florida, the main one of which is a charge of sex discrimination against the whole State University system. The 6 sources used are: (1) Institutional Research Report No. 46, which discusses data on degrees held, amount of professional experience, rank, salaries, and incremental increases; (2) the 1970-71 Bulletin which covers some of the same data in tabular form; (3) University Planning Report No. 4, February 27, 1970, which includes information on ranks held within colleges, mean and median salaries for administrative and teaching personnel by rank, and the women above and below the college and University salary average; (4) an updated staff list for 1970, which contains data on degrees held, the number of men and women by colleges, and the mean salary for administrative and teaching personnel by rank and position held; (5) the "New Faculty Lists for 1970-71," which compares those newly hired by college and rank; and (6) responses from 82 questionnaires completed by University faculty women which cover summer work, experience, years in field, tenure, administrative responsibility, committee work, teaching load, salaries, publications and grants, and financial responsibilities. (AF)

ED049688

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Title

Status of Women Committee, Faculty Report, November 18, 1970.

by Maxine MacKay

Discrimination based on sex is just as real as discrimination based on race or religion or color or national origin and just as unlawful under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Yet it is so deeply embedded in the American way of life and the American way of business that few people recognize it as discrimination and fewer still understand that it is illegal. -- Commissioner Elizabeth J. Kuck of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, June 11, 1969.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 088

The order of the report is as follows:

I. Explanation of AAUP Report.

P.5 1969 II. Prior study of status of women; USF Institutional Report No. 46. Feb. 1969

P. 8 III. Comparisons based on the 1970-71 Bulletin, as of December 30, 1969.

P 10 Oct 1969 IV. Pertinent Statistics from University Planning Report No. 4 (February 27, 1970), Personnel Salary and Tenure Study, Data as of October, 1969: comparisons and analysis, particularly of salary and rank.

P. 15 V. Comparison of male and female faculty based on approximate degrees with selected salary averages and data, updated list of staff, as of November 18, 1970: rank and distribution by colleges.

P. 18 VI. Comparative analysis of hiring practices: new staff. for Sept 1970

P.19 1970? VII. Analysis of questions from form circulated to USF women.

VIII. Summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Reasons for an AAUP report on the Employment Status of USF Women

The underrepresentation of women in the academic structure has been noted throughout the country. Although women make up a quarter of the teaching faculties in American Colleges and Universities, they are usually employed in the lower ranks and levels. Less than ten per cent of them become full professors. Some universities, as Harvard, have denied them tenure.

At the present moment, the entire State University System of Florida has been charged with sex discrimination. The need for such federal action seems strange in a state in which "discrimination on the basis of sex has been prohibited in state employment for several years" (Jay McGlon, State Personnel Director, paraphrased in The Tampa Tribune, April 29, 1969). The bias complaint was filed on May 25, 1970, with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which forbids all Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin and sex. Investigation of such charges against universities is the responbility of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the Department of Labor. If discrimination exists, funds under federal contract will be -- and have been -- withheld. (Harvard and Michigan are recent examples.) The charges cover admissions, financial aids, hiring and promoting, and salary differentials; and they were made by the Women's Equity Action League (with the endorsement and support of Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, D. Mich., and Representative Edith Green, D. Ore.)

Thus all possible data on the employment status of USF women is immediately pertinent.

In theory, there is no discrimination based on sex. Many administrative officers of colleges and universities are unaware that inequalities exist. "School administrators and professors," writes Marilyn Mercer, "point to individually successful women; they note that many women appear unmotivated; and they will tell you, sorrowfully, that they want qualified women but they can't find them. Nonetheless, every academic woman from the new M.A. candidate to the full professor, knows that she is, to some degree still a second-class citizen." (Glamour, August, 1970, p. 190). This writer describes an experiment made by Dr. Linda Fidell of San Fernando Valley State College. Fictitious biographies of young Ph.D.'s were sent to 228 colleges and universities, on two forms. The forms were identical in content -- half male and half female -- with the names reversed by sex from Form A to Form B. Thus a "James Ross" on form A became a "Janet Ross" on Form B. In all instances except one, the females were rated as less desirable faculty than the males and would have been hired at a lower rank.

The "shortage of qualified women" is, according to Dr. Bernice Sandler, a myth. Dr. Sandler is an employee of HEW, Chairman of the Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education, WEAL and serves as assistant in the office of Representative Edith Green:

> Columbia University awards 24% of its doctorates to women, but only 2% of its tenured graduate faculty are women ..... Where do women go? .... Do they marry and give up their careers? This is another academic myth: 90% of the women with doctorates are working. Many end up teaching on the faculty of junior colleges and community colleges where they comprise about 40% of the faculty, and where the pay, status, and research opportunities are substantially less than in the major universities .... The Chairman of a department sees nothing wrong in paying a woman less because 'she is married and therefore doesn't need as much' or paying her less because 'she is not married and therefore doesn't need as much.' Many of the most ardent supporters of civil rights for blacks, Indians, Spanish-speaking

Americans and other minority groups simply do not view sex discrimination as discrimination."

It is difficult to believe that qualified academic women are not available for higher, as well as lower, faculty ranks. Here are samples of the percentage of doctorates earned by women:

Area	Per cent
General Biology	29
Biochemistry	22.3
Education of Mentally Retarded	44.4
Art Education	34
Counseling & Guidance	20.9
English and Literature	27.4
Linguistics	20.6
Philology and Literature of Romance Language....	35.8
Psychology	22.5
Anthropology	23.9
General Arts	25

The above is but a random sampling, from Earned Degrees Conferred: Part A - Summary Date, Office of Education, OE-54013-68A.

These, then, are the charges. How specifically will they be answered at USF?

A questionnaire was sent to all of the academic women (Administrative and Personnel and Research and Teaching) who were named in the Bulletin of the University of South Florida, Accent on Learning, 1970-71. While this list of personnel is subject to some omissions, no current list of USF academic staff was available.

The catalogue served ably enough as an indication of relative employment status and was supplemented by personnel data from other sources. (See form attached.)

One hundred forty-three questionnaires were mailed. A number were returned for improper address or because the staff member was no longer at USF. More than half -- eighty -- were completed. The data and comments are analysed at the end of this report, after the tedium of statistical statement.

There were only twenty days from the AAUP request for data on the status of women until the time of its general reports to the faculty on November 18. Thus niceties of computer analysis were not possible or glossy, executive format. No member of the committee is a statistician. Percentages, for example, are more often in round numbers than third decimal points. Yet the material gathered presents distinct trends of inequalities. Therefore the study will continue, from this interim report.

A confidential dossier was prepared for each woman on the academic staff; it was used as a work-sheet in compiling information listed below and contains the following information:

Name; Rank; Degrees; College and Field; Years at USF;
Total years of experience in field at college level;
total grants, publications, speeches; financial data -
head of household, responsible for support of self and/or
others; hours taught per term in lower level, upper level,
graduate level; approximate number of students taught per term;
approximate number of advisees; salary - 9 mos. or 12 mos;
average salary for same rank, in the college or work area
and in the university; average salary and rank of nearest
male equivalent, if known; hours per term of community
service; administrative duties and department and university
committees.

These dossiers have been completed, to a fair extent, and will be valuable as the basis of further reference and continued study.

Prior Professional Status of Women Study, at USF

Institutional Research Report No. 46, dated February 21, 1969, indicated these comparisons of experience and education differences in male and female faculty:

62.9 per cent of the men had earned doctorates as compared with 33.3 per cent of the women. In experience, not quite one half (45.7%) of the men had less than one to five years experience as compared to 74.6% of the women. Possibly the remaining 25.4 per cent women, with greater experience, fared badly as a result. Their salary, increment, and rank showed no great advance over those of the majority; nor did those women with doctoral degrees find emoluments perceptibly greater than in the lower ranks.

In rank, only 14.3 per cent of the women were associate (12.7) and full (1.6) professors; and 21.9 per cent more women were instructors than were men.

Nearly all of the women faculty were paid distinctly less than the men. At the time of the report, no woman faculty member earned above $16,000 (12 mos.) although exactly one-fifth of the faculty was paid more. In the Liberal Arts College, only 5.9 per cent of its women made over $13,000, even though 56.8 per cent of its men made more. No woman in the College of Education was paid over $15,000; yet 28 per cent of its male academic staff earned above this figure.

Lowest of all was the College of Basic Studies, which gave no female on the faculty a salary above $13,000. At the same time the College of Basic Studies paid 43.9 per cent of its male faculty more than this sum.

The importance of the low payments is that these three colleges, at the time, had 62.9 per cent of the entire women faculty.

Increment was even more bleak. 14 per cent of the men and no women had salary avarages of $1,000 or more and 48.2 per cent or nearly half the men, averaged above $750. 38.5 per cent of the women, as compared to 28.3 per cent of the men, averaged less than $500, for reasons best known to their chairmen and deans.

The findings of this institutional report were summarized by Dr. Edwin P. Martin, Dean of the College of Basic Studies, who had made the research:

> This study has shown clearly that, on the one hand, the women on the USF faculty have less formal education and less experience than their male colleagues. On the other hand, it is equally clear that, as a group, women are paid less, ranked lower, and given less prestigious assignments. To what extent the lower qualifications account for the reduced rewards cannot be determined accurately. It is my opinion that sufficient indication of discrimination against women was found to require careful attention from the administration of the University of South Florida, and serious consideration of each individual woman on the faculty to insure equitable treatment.

This Committee is sorry to report that nothing in the following tables and data and questionnaire response indicates that any signal thing was done to alleviate the conditions Dean Martin noted. There was awareness of the lower rank and pay and some oral statement that the inequities existed. Perhaps a few instances -- as the appointment of a woman as Director of Libraries* and a woman Coordinator of Advising, plus greater awareness of lower general status, were influenced by the Institutional Report.

Discrimination is subtle and difficult to pinpoint. There seems to be a tendency to think of women in university place as in "a very good job for a woman" and one not lightly discarded or easily obtained.

* Correction: Appointment was prior to the report.
E.M.M.

The very men who do not compare themselves with career service staff all too readily, in this statement, make the female professorial comparison with clerks, typists, and other heroic and low-paid employees. Thus when the monies are "tight" there is all too human a temptation to let the economy increments be distributed to the women academic staff. Another unmeasurable inequality is the fact that any employment minority -- women no less than black or Spanish Americans -- must literally "work harder" and continously prove its worth. The questionnaire has brought some very discouraged career comments, particularly from senior women at USF, the confidentiality of which is here respected.

There may have been improvement since the Institutional Report, in individual hirings. In the College of Basic Studies and elsewhere new women faculty, together with new male faculty, have been hired at larger initial salaries than those who have worked steadily and competently for from five to ten years at USF. It is at least cheering to see the women take their place in bargaining for a substantial beginning emolument.

However, one should note the dismal comparisons, in part VI of this report, on the recently hired faculty at USF.

The complete budget figures, for the current year, have not yet been broken down statistically from the three-inch thickness of their many pages, which have just been released. In fact, this year's budget has not yet been formally approved in Tallahassee.

Thus the most accurate comparisons in salary will be found in the next two sections of the report.

Comparisons based on academic staff
listed in the 1970-71 Bulletin
as of December 30, 1969

There were 653 men and 147 women in the combined faculties: Administrative and P rofessional and Teaching and Research. These were classified, by rank, as follows:

Classification	Men	Women
Professor	110	2
Associate	179	25
Assistant	247	61
Instructor	40	16
Lecturer	21	9
Other (incl. professional and teach. assistants)	56	23
	653	147

(Figures include adjunct and parttime. Research assistants and associates are not separately classified. Deans and associate deans are included in their respective faculty ranks.)

A tally indicates that 289 of 653 men were in the upper ranks as compared with 27 of 147 women. Thus 44.2 percent of the men were in the higher income brackets of associate and professor but these ranks included only 18.3 per cent of the women.

A classification by academic degrees mitigates this /harsh/ figure:

Classification	Male	Female
Doctorate	378	30
Master's	215	90
Bachelor's	38	27
Professional and other	22	(3)
	653	147

(Staff with both professional and academic degrees included within the academic.)

There is a high percentage of doctorates among the men: 57.8.
There is a much smaller percentage among the women: 20.4.

A continuing question among those who study the status of 1 university women is whether or not women are discouraged by counselors and professors as they seek advanced degrees; and the consensus is that they are. Others point out that universities are reluctant to hire women with doctorates, initially, into higher ranks -- not until they have p roved themselves with substantial prior scholarly performance and experience. Very probably the current "buyer's" market makes many young men with new Ph.D's available for consideration. The hiring practice, then, may limit the number of women doctorates on the staff. One can note further in this study the large numbers of instructors and lecturers, research assistants and assistant teachers among women's ranks.

Classification by administrative place

10 of the 147 women had the following administrative kpositions:

Dean	2	(Dean of Women; Dean of College of Nursing)
Asst. Dean	1	(of Women)
Director	2	(Libraries; Student Organizations)
Coordinator	3	(Education programs; advising)
Librarian	2	(Special Collections; Documents)

This is a very small proportion of all the administrative and higher professional and academic place occupied by men members of the staff. In fact, it is not quite .03 per cent. Administrative rank, at USF as elsewhere in universities generally, is largely closed to women. Some of the complaints on the questionnaires specifically said that one's creative teaching and administrative ideas would be more readily acceptable if they came from othe "male equivalent." Another discriminatory subtlety is, in some instances, the light manner in which ideas from women faculty are received.

University Planning Report No. 4 (dated February 27, 1970); Personnel Salary and Tenure Study, Data as of October, 1969: an analysis and comparison of statistics.

Planning Report No. 4 makes these tallies and classifications of faculty at USF in Quarter I, 1969:

		Salary Data: 12-months			
Classification	Number	Male	Female	Median	Mean
President	1	1	0	---	---
Adminis. and Profess.	93(93)	65(65)	28	12,100	12,659
Teaching and Research	747.	628	129	14,900	15,636
		684	157		

These figures include possible omissions from the Bulletin list of December 30, 1969.

Of general interest is the Median Salary Comparison of Teaching and Re=search faculties by Rank and College, Table 3. THESE ARE 12=MONTH salaries and those for professor-rank include chairmen-professors; assistant and associate deans.

TABLE 3 --MEDIAN SALARY COMPARISON (12-mo)

Classification	N	Total T&R	N	Basic Studies	N	Bus. Admn.
Professor	105	20,700	13	20,500	6	21,000
Assoc. Prof.	193	16,800	22	15,100	21	17,000
Assist. Prof.	306	14,000	45	12,500	33	15,000
Instructor	46	11,034	7	10,200	9	11,000

Classification	L N	Educ.	N	Engr.	N	Lib. Arts	N	Other
Professor	20,	19,667 16,634	8	23,834	51	21,100	7	21,000
Assoc. Prof.	48	~~10,600~~ ,	13	,18,600	68	16,800	21	17,500
Assist. Prof.	54	14,000	12	15,250	117	14,133	45	14,000
Instructor	10	10,947	0	---	14	11,264	6	9,650

It will be noted that those colleges in which the largest numbers of women are found, Basic Studies and Education, have the lowest median salaries, rank by rank. Thus lower salaries for women are emphasized in these areas by a lower general comparison with other colleges. Tables 5 and 6 of the Planning Report make this classification by number, rank, sex and salary:

Table 5 (excerpts)
Administrative and Professional Salary Data

Classification	N	Male	Female	Median	Mean
Vice Pres. and Dean	2	2	0	---	---
Dean	1	1	0	---	---
Director	28	26	2	15,350	15,799
Asst. Director	4	3	1	12,825	12,761
Associate Curator	1	1	0	---	---
Computer Res. Specialist	2	2	0	---	---
Coordinator	6	5	1	11,230	11,267
Curator	1	1	0	---	---
Librarian	7	4	3	12,000	11,889
Associate Librarian	4	1	3	10,270	10,143
Physician	2	2	0	---	---
Assistant Librarian	15	5	10	8,000	8,075
Psychiatrists	1	1	0	---	---
Psychologists	7	5	2	12,076	12,956
Residence Counselor	10	4	6	8,000	7,943
Systems Coordinator	2	2	0	---	---
TOTAL ADMN. AND PROF.	93	65	28	12,100	12,659

The small relative proportion of women to men, on the administrative and professional staff, is noticeable. Two-thirds of the librarians are female; one can note that the salaries in the library are low, in comparison with competitive markets. Whether or not sex is related to the low increment cannot be determined.

Table 6 (excerpts)
Teaching and Research Faculty 12-mos. Salary Data

Classification	N	Male	Female	Median	Mean
Vice President & Dean	1	1	0	---	---
Dean	6	5	1	26,000	25,217
Professor	107	105	2	20,700	21,266
Associate Professor	195	181	14	16,800	16,937
Assistant Professor	307	255	52	14,000	13,959
Instructor	55	32 (32)	23	11,084 11,034	10,786 10,786
Lecturer	58	33	25	11,664	11,637
Teach. & Resear. Assoc.	7	4	3	9,650	10,626
Teach. & Resear. Asst.	11	2	9	9,364	9,482
TOTAL TEACH. AND RES.	747	618	129	14,9000	15,636

These figures show, as did those above, that an exceedingly small proportion of the women are in upper levels and salaries. The salaries are based on twelve-months. Because USF has converted to a nine-month faculty salary basis, and there appears to be not enough teaching in Quarter IV for all of its faculty, those who do not teach will have suffered a substantial loss in guaranteed annual income. Nice as the long vacation may be.., it is to be hoped that the same types of economy as those which affect increment for women are not felt in greater proportion next summer by one sex than by the other. Women, also, as the questionnaires indicated, have head-of-household responsibility and that of support for others. (See below.)

What significance is the classification of female and male members of the teaching and research staff by colleges? The Planning Report lists these comparative numbers in the colleges:

Basic Studies	Male	Female	Upper Ranks
Professor	15	0	35 of 70 men 50%
Associate	20	3	3 of 28 women 11%
Assistant	31	15	
Instructor	4	10	
	70	28	
Business Adminis.			
Professor	6	0	26 of 68 men
Associate	21	0	No women
Assistant	31	2	
Instructor	10	0	
	68	2	
Education			
Professor	16	1	56 of 98 men 55%
Associate	38	8	9 of 31 women 29%
Assistant	39	16	
Instructor.	4	6	
	98	31	

Engineering	Male	Female	Upper Ranks
Professor	8	0	20 of 32 men
Associate	12	0	No women
Assistant	12.	0	
Instructor	0	0	
	32	0	

Liberal Arts

Natural Sciences	Male	Female	Upper Ranks
Professor	14	0	39 of 73 men
Associate	25	0	No women
Assistant	34	1	
Instructor	0	0	
	73	1	

Fine Arts			
Professor	8	0	20 of 40 men 50%
Associate	12	2	2 of 10 women 20%
Assistant	18	8	
Instructor	2	0	
	40	10	

Language Literature			
Professor	14	1	29 of 47 men 82%
Associate	15	0	1 of 6 women 17%
Assistant	13	3	
Instructor	5	2	
	47	6	

Social Sciences			
Professor	12	0	25 of 68 men 37%
Associate	13	1	1 o f 5 women 20%
Assistant	37	3	
Instructor	6	1	
	68	5	

The above figures very forcibly emphasize that upper ranks are virtually closed to university women. 248 of 496 men listed above are in higher levels, which is exactly 50%. On the other hand, a mere 16 of 83 women listed above are in the upper ranks, or 20%. The pattern of doctorates does not indicate so small an available supply of trained women.

Social Sciences and Language Literature, as well as Fine Arts, are not utilizing women in the very areas in which they earn relatively high comparative numbers of Ph.D's.

Salary averages by four academic ranks, within the respective colleges as of October, 1969, were:

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor
Basic Studies	20,115	15,273	12,862	10,051
Business Admn.	21,033	17,386	15,323	11,304
Education	19,626	16,813	13,515	10,841
Engineering	23,384	18,764	15,267	[illegible]
Liberal Arts	21,306	16,847	14,101	11,245
(Chairmen-professors included above; deans, associate and assistant deans not included.)				
Other (Phys.Ed., Nursing, Computer Research Center, Grants)	20,000	17,111	13,812	9,703

Based on the above tables, one can make the following estimate of the number of full-time faculty women who were below, or above, University averages for their rank:

BELOW: 75 were below either the college average or the University average -- or below both.

	Number Below
College of Basic Studies	29
College of Business Administration	2
College of Education	26
College of Engineering	1
College of Liberal Arts	16
	75

ABOVE: 35 were above either the college average or the University average -- or above both.

These figures continue to indicate a highly conservative pattern of salary and increment, for women. 69 were beneath the University average and 55 were beneath the college average. Comments on questionnaires, together with the statistics, suggest that the least fortunate of the women's group are the employees who have been a long time at USF. As one of them phrased it piquantly, years of employment have given her much work, have kept her from being anything but a teacher, and have

given her much of a "nothing title" -- this even though her program organization was of recognized worth. The same is true for those women with doctoral degrees, whose salaries are often well below average but whose work may compare favorably with that of the much higher salaried and nearest "male equivalent," in responsibility and experience and performance of duties. As of December 30, 1969, 30 women had doctorates at USF but only two -- less than one per cent -- were of professorial rank.

Over half the women staff of the colleges are in Basic Studies and Education. Attention has been drawn to the small numbers in Liberal Arts. For example, only 5 of 72 total in the Social Sciences are women.

Comparison of Male and Female Faculty
By Rank and Work-Area (Approximate number, based on new faculty lists)

Nov. 18 1970

Total male 801
Total female: 209

Comparison by Rank

Classification	Mean Salary (12-mo)	Male	Female
President	---	1	0
VP and Dean	----	1	0
Dean	25,217	6	1 (1 prof)
Professor	21,266	120	1
Assoc. Professor	16,937	194	17
Assistant Professor	13,959	323	63
Instructor	10,786	39	20
Lecturer	11,637	38	30
Teaching and Res. Assoc.	10,626	7	6
Teach and Res. Asst.	9,482	1	39
		730	177

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL

Classification	Mean Salary	Male	Female
VP and Dean	----	2	0
Dean	----	1	1 (1 prof)
Director	15,799	27	2
Assistant Director	12,761	3	2 (1 inst)
Associate Curator	----	1	0
Computer Res. Spec.	----	2	0

Coordinator	11,267	5	3 (2 asst. prof.; 1 inst)
Curator	---	5	1 (1 inst)
Librarian	11,889	4	3
Associate Librarian	10,143	1	2
Assistant Librarian	8,075	6	10
Physician	----	2	0
Psychiatrist	----	1	0
Psychologist	12,956	6	1
Res. Counselor	7,943	7	7 (7 inst)
Systems Coordinator	----	2	0
		71	32

The above classifications speak for themselves They indicate little change in the relative percentages of male and female faculty in the higher academic ranks. They show a tendency to utilize women as Lecturers and Teaching and Resident Assistants (69 of 177 total) more readily .than in the traditional academic ranks. What lies behind this trend is not ascertainable at the moment or whether or not it has reference to an assumed greater mobility of women or to aspects of tenure. Professional women are eager to avoid clustering of typing, either in the lower categories or in the concept of a terminal M.A. as proper for women. Noticeable also is the smaller number of administrative places open to women.

Although the salary mean is that of 12-months, it can serve as a basis for comparing the salaries of women faculty before conversion to 9-month salaries. Incidentally, the current budget shows the following average salaries for continuing positions in the four top academic ranks:

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All
9-month	17,693	14,369	11,973	9,622	13,120
12-month	21,619	19,323	15,144	12,158	20,470

The current budget shows the fo1l owing frequency distribution of raises for continuing faculty:(It includes 9 and 12 Month Positions.)

Percent Increase	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor
0 - 5	25.5	42.8	75.2	32.6
5 - 10	70	96.0	155.3	14.0
10 - 20	20.0	48.0	44.0	5.5
15 - 20	3.3	5.5	9.0	5.0
20 - +	3.0	8.0	11.0	8.5

20% is usually the top increment. Professors and Associates have the greatest chance for increment above 10%. Thus women faculty, who are primarily in the lower ranks, have least opportunity for substantial increments.

Comparison by Work Area

Work Area	Male	Female
Basic Studies	79 (10%)	60 (29%)
Business Administration	81	6
Education	224 (14%)	54 (25%)
Engineering	46	1
Liberal Arts	272 (34%)	48 (23%)
Nursing	0	2
Libraries	10	15
Other Admn. & Prof.	55	17
Other (incl. pttime; grants; teach. and res. assoc. and asst.; lecturer)	134	6
	801	209

These classifications indicate that Liberal Arts has the largest numerical faculty among the academic male staff (34%), or just over one-third . Yet it employs but 23% of the female faculty, or approximately one-fifth.

The College of Education employs 14% of the male faculty and 25% of the female faculty. The College of Basic Studies uses just under 10% of the male academic staff and 29% of the female. Almost 55% of the total female faculty is in these two colleges.

Comparison by Classification of Degrees

(Approximate figures only; these estimates are an updating of those of the 1970-71 USF Bulletin, December 30, 1969, from new faculty lists.)

Degree	Male	Female	
Doctorate	418 (45%)	35 (17%)	
Master's	311 (39%)	115 (55%)	
Bachelor's	44	59	
Professional	28	(3)	incl. in academic rank
	801	209	

Comparative Figures from the "New Faculty Lists" 1970-71

Perhaps the most discouraging comparisons of all are those indicated by current new hirings:

Total hired: 137 Male: 117 Female: 20

Comparative Figures for New Faculty, by Work-Area, are:

Work-area	Male	Female
Basic Studies	9	3
Business Admn.	13	0
Engineering	14	0
Education	26	7
Liberal Arts	45	6
Medicine	6	0
Other (teaching ranks)	3	2
Libraries	1	2
	117	20

Comparative Figures for New Faculty by Rank

Classification	Male	Female	
Dean	1	0	
Director	1	0	
Professor(incl. chair.)	15	0	
Associate	13	2	
Assistant	69	5	
Instructor	8	8	
Asst. Librarian	1	2	
Other	0	1	
Lecturer	5	2	
Psychologist	1	0	
Resident Counselor	3	0	
	117	20	(16%)

The figures carry their own message. Only 7 of 20 women were hired in the upper three (or tenure) ranks. Only one percent (two) were hired as associates. Only 16% of the new faculty is female; and of that group, 99% are in the lower ranks.

Observations and conclusions on new hirings: Chairmen and Deans hire few women, certainly not in a time of "tight" money or job openings. As of December 30, 1969, the percentage of women faculty was 28. To hire only 16% of women faculty in September, 1970, is to tend toward further inequality and lessening of the total percentage of women academic staff at USF. To hire no new doctorates cuts, increasingly, the percentage of women with doctoral degrees on the USF campus.

Report of Data Submitted on Questionnaire Sent to USF Women on the Academic Staff, Listed in 1970-71 Bulletin of USF

The form was sent to some 143 of the Administrative and Professional and Teaching and Research Staff. Of this group, several were returned because the addressee had left the University. 82 completed answers form the basis of the statistics listed below:

Summer Work: Only 5 of 82 are sure of working in Quarter IV.

Experience:

Years at USF	Number
1 - 3	36
4 - 6	27
7 - 10	18

45 of 82 women have been at USF from four to ten years. (21 of them have tenure.)

Years in Field:	Years	Number
	1 - 3	19
	4 - 6	28
	7 - 9	8
	10 - 12	7
	13 - 15	6
	16 - 18	4
	19 - 21	8

33 of 82 women have had seven or more years in teaching and/or professional duties at college level. 12 of 82 have had more than fifteen years of academic experience.

Tenure: 21 of 82 listed tenure.

Note: Librarians do not earn tenure. It is, to them, a source of professional distress that they cannot do so.

Administrative Responsibility:

The following administrative offices were listed:

Chairman, or former chairman 4

Director 1

Dean 1

Librarian 1

Coordinator 7

Grant Administration 7

The number of University or Division committees was:

Number Comm.	Number Women
1 - 3	23
4 - 6	3

Department Committee assignments were less frequent. Two reported serving on from one to three. Some Administrative responsibility for portions of departmental programs, on the other hand, was listed by 18 of 82 . Analysis of the above answers shows that the tally of administrative responsibility in departments is fullest in the College of Education and the Libraries. Seven women coordinate programs, or

advising. Four are, or have been, chairmen of departments. Only three (one faculty member and 2 librarians) are members of the USF Senate. In committees women seem to receive far more recognition from the University than from their respective departments. Women will probably never be elected to the Senate so long as voting is by colleges; for the male faculty has always a "favorite son" candidate in each separate college segment.

Academic Teaching Load: 28 of 82 women teach graduate courses; but only 3 teach more than 7 hours of graduate work per term. 51 women teach in the upper level classes and 25 teach in lower level. Few women faculty are assigned exclusively to any one area; and the distribution is roughly proportionate to the distribution of students in the three levels. Teaching Load by student-numbers is as follows:

N Students	Teachers	Advisers
1 - 25	1	16
26 - 50	7	5
51 - 75	14	3
76 - 100	13	2
101 - 125	5	1
126 -150	5	1
151 -200	2	0
201- 300	2	2

The teaching and advising loads vary. 17% teach more than 100 students per term.

Salaries: Only 7 of 82 academic women reported a salary above the average 9-months faculty salary of $13,570 as suggested in comparative salaries, The Margin, Vol. 2, No. 2, October, 1970). Those 7 included one administrative officer (dean).

Publications and Grants:

There are, on the forms, a total of 156 publications and 30 grants. Based on the above totals, absence of publication and grants, among academic women at USF, does not seem a valid factor in their general and

and relatively lower rank and salary.

Community Activities:

82 responses list the following:

850 hours in community organizations, per term.

86 total offices in such organizations.

368 plus total speeches.

The USF women seem a distinct factor in promoting community rapports.

Financial Responsibilities:

31 women listed themselves as head-of-household.

33 , in addition to the above, contribute to support of others and have responsibility for their own support.

14 reported neither of the above.

2 did not complete the question

"Too many male faculty," wrote one respondent, " do not realize that women are financial heads of their families." The point is one which academic women repeatedly urged this report to emphasize. Answers to questions which concerned male statement about academic women:

The first question: "Do you feel that you, as a woman member of the academic staff, give less time and attention to your work than do the men in your area, due to home duties and other "feminine concerns"?

brought no affirmative response. Sample comments (not here identified by writer) included the cost of housekeepers and the cost of babysitters. ("And not one dime deductible!") Other answers were colorful:

"Are you kidding! No!"

"Absolutely not!"

"In general, a larger majority of women divide their time and interest between their home and their professional careers (which is the way it should be). However, if a woman is strictly a career person she should have the same opportunities as men as far as salary and promotion are concerned. She should be judged on her individual merits just as men are and not as women vs. men."

"I have no feminine concerns; I bought a wig to avoid going to the beauty shop."

"No ..... I do much of the nitty-gritty (at school)."

"I spend so much time (at USF) that my husband is at home more than I am."

"Less (time) than the most respected of my colleagues."

For some reason, answeres to this questions were filled with exclamation points and "absolutely not's".

The three questions based on USF Institutional Research Report No. 46 (Feb. 21, 1969), which listed comments on hiring practices from departmental chairmen, were:

"Although there are many good women, I am reluctant to hire women over thirty-five because of previous bad experience."
Do you feel that women over thirty-five are a poor employment risk? _____ If so, do they compare unfavorably with men over thirty-five?_____

"Single women are poor risks because they do not stay in teaching and often become less involved in their jobs than men." Do you agree? _____ "Women are more frequently concerned with individual status than men, and more often display a petty agressiveness and a sense of irrelevant competition."
Are women more petty and agressive, professionally, than are men? _____ More competitive? _____ Less "relevant in competition" for rank and salary? _____

They provoked further exclamation points and a variety of answers which ranged from the indignant to the analysis of types of generalization.

"Such statements," wrote one respondent, "are based on opinion and belief, rather than on factual data. They reflect stereotyped thinking, to which department chairmen, 'educated' though they be, are not immune. My own belief is that women in Academe and other professions are less competitive than men because of social and cultural pressure and sex-role training."

Other responses rightly criticized the fuzziness of the questions and the validity of the comments on the qeustionnaire. They were included in the Institutional Report and in the questionnaire as a reflection of attitudes on the part of some who determine hiring of women and their salaries and increments. The Institutional Report probed into the general subject of minority discriminations. At least one answer on the questionnaire felt that such statements were a prima facie evidence of bias. But, the Committee admits to including them as much for the interest and variety of the answers they elicited as for any other reason.

Two answers partially endorsed the chairmen's critisicms. The reluctante to hire women over 35 brought definite response.

"Single women, because they are single and therefore dependent upon themselves for support, have to become "involved" in their jobs."

The comments and addenda and definition of difficulties are confidential. Some of them contained excellent suggestions. A number expressed satisfaction with status and locus of work. Praise was highest for professional attitudes and acceptance, on the part of male colleagues, in the College of Business.

In general, the personal comments indicated a tone of ddep concern with the problems of minority employment status. There was also a reflection of involvement with one's work and a mood of genuine professionalism in seeking answers to the difficulties. Some of the comments, particularly from long-time members of the USF academic staff showed discouragement with lack of progress and recognition after years of competent performance of duties. As one women in the first faculty phrased it, "there was always the sense of having invaded a man's world" -- of being taken "just not too seriously"-- of "being on the outside looking in."

An institutional report on the status of women at USF will be undertaken by related committees and groups; and the present report will be continued and updated with new budget and personnel figures, when they are classified and available.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The women members of the academic staff are grateful for the interest which male colleagues and administrators and college deans, have expressed in their effort to achieve higher professional aceeptance and emolument. Much as the women appreciate this sympathetic interest, they seem -- in what is no accidental pattern of response -- to want tangible token of a change in the old academic protocol and cliches of status which affect them.

They want those who determine their status to recognize that salary discrimination exists; that discriminations are real even though they are more the result of social custom than of design. Women want the "powers that be" to "do something about it, "both at the University policy levels and at the "nitty-gritty" level of rank-salary decision. There is consensus in the questionnaires and accompanying statements that women academic staff want no special favors. In asking for equality of employment, they are eliminating consideration on other than individual and professional merit. This means that they will exchange the old chivalric amenities for employment realities; they will trust men and women to the reciprocal courtesies common to all academic gentility -- in exchange for acceptance as serious career members of Academia. Very few, as the data indicate, are responsible merely for their sole support; nearly all are contributing to family income and/or the support of others.

These women, together with all the low-salaried academic staff at USF, recently took a long, difficult look at the equation of "take-home" pay and cost-of-living and whether or not new retirement plans and insurances were prohibitive in cost. The senior woman, particularly, faces a sharp reality: retirement at a low salary average. To phrase this problem from a slightly different slant, one can say that those malemembers of the academic staff who have low salaries tend to be young men not close to retirement years; and those men professors who are near retirement will do so with an average

salary substantially higher than that of their female equivalent's in years of teaching, type of teaching, and degreees and training.

Thea bove factor and the statistics collected here and elsewhere suggest inequality falls heavily upon the 17-20% of the women academic staff who have doctoral degrees and/or seniority of experience. Disparities are none the less prevalent in all ranks and areas.

What can be done specifically and immediately, at USF, to improve the status of its minority group of academic women?

There are seven recommendations, several of which are explained in the following discussion. These recommendations are:

1. That ceiteria for promotion to professor and associate ranks deemphasize publication and reemphasize teaching and community service and that chairman so instruct departmental faculty committees which formulate the criteria. As will be stressed, this recommendation is not for the benefit of any one sex -- although it will aid women faculty -- but for that of the entire University and particularly for its students.

2. That deans and chairmen be urged to take note of the following factors and conditions:

    a. The lack of change in relative inequities, even though prior report has shown them to exist.

    b. The need for incisive steps to correct these inequities.

    c. The fact that qualified women are available for positions and can be considered with more frequency than in the immediate past. (Women complain that the very professors who trained them in graduate schools refuse, later, to recognize them as colleagues.)

    d. The impossibility of rewarding women for administrative and departmental general duties when such appointive responsibilities are assigned to them infrequently, or not at all.

e, The fact that a bias-complaint against Florida Universities has been made with the Department of Labor and could be activated by congressional request or pressure from women's groups throughout the State.

f. The problem of thinking of a terminal master's degree as proper for women; and the bearing such thought has on non-assignment of women with doctor's and professional degrees to rank-salary-duties like those of their "male equivalents."

g. The need to exercise caution in graduate programs that quotas based on sex (prevalent in older universities) are not made in the future and that future entrance requirements are no higher for one sex than for the other.

h. The need to urge male professors -- especially the younger professors -- to encourage older women who return to USF for continuing education and graduate study.

3. That deans and chairmen submit to an ad hoc committee, or to the Equal Opportunity Officer, a brief form for each academic woman, comparing her education, experience, general duties, rank, salary and total increments with those of her "nearest male equivalent" on their staffs . . . such definitive minority study to remain in University files as data for any future questions that may arise externally on the subject of the employment status of USF women.

4. That review of budget distribution be made in the two colleges in which the majority of the USF academic women are employed, to see if money can be released from miscellaneous categories for increasing low salaries.

5. That the duties of academic advisers on release time for advising -- a staff heavily female in membership -- be given a professional up-grading reflected in salary and rank; and that, if need be, such increase be justified on the basis of general sums allotted for advising in the University budget.

6. That the University relax its somewhat rigid stand on the "nepotism" rule, the observance of which is not required by law, and judge each employment family relationship on its own merit; thus:

    a. freeing women from employment marital dependency at a time when incomes of both husband and wife are usually required in the total family budget;

    b. securing for itself a valuable employment resource.

7. That care be taken, in budget allocations for the Libraries, not to be conservative in salary estimates for a staff with a fair percentage of women. The efficiency of our Libraries, and their favorable comparison with those of other universities deserves increment comparable with the "going rate" for librarians in competitive institutions.

Addenda to the Recommendations:

USF women list a creditable total of publication, Yet deemphasis of publication as a criterion for promotion would be to their benefit.

Unlike her British counterpart, the American academic woman can rarely be a name-scholar. To the book-journal trade, she is an unknown associate, or assistant, professor who has been chairman of no department, purchaser of no departmental textbooks, head of no section at the annual meetings of professional associations.

A doctoral degree trains for research -- not necessarily for teaching. The women at USF have shown themselves a competent teaching faculty. They have dealt very directly with large numbers of students and advisees; and many of them have shown themselves to be student-oriented.

In these parlous academic times, students themselves are seeking to put the accent back on teaching. It is no accident that graduate teaching assistants are preponderantly female in number. Yet men faculty would benefit greatly from the deemphasis of publication. The pace of the present term and the increasing student population make a combination of good teaching and good research a schizophrenic and precarious balance.

Although research and publication increase university prestige, this prestige is inbred among universities and academic circles. University prestige, itself, has been totally and severely attacked in shifting social upheavals of the immediate past. There is no strength in a polarity in university academic staffs -- one in which affluent and aloof research faculty inhabit a different campus from their poorer teaching acquaintances. A university is not a strong university when it is filled with the "haves" and the "have nots" separated by a none too healthy middle budgetary range. Classes of professors are thus artificially created based upon criteria which may themselves be increasingly artificial in the serious confrontation of national government with the schools.

A total budget review, with a look at the wide ranges within the respective salaried ranks, is a serious recommendation.

It is also suggested that the questionnaires have shown a large and vigorous interest in community organizations, so much so that such acitivity could, perhaps, be a compensatory promotional offset for those women whose publication is considered slender in volume.

Finally, this Committee urges action to alleviate inequities because it has noted, in the confidential comments, evidence of discouragement among professional women who face the closed doors of upper rank and salary and, in consequence, work unnecessarily from self-consciousness and resignation and lowered teaching morale.

Respectfully submitted,

Maxine MacKay

Maxine MacKay,
Chairman,
AAUP Committee on the Employment
Status of Women.